GUIDE TO THE SF24 URU FILE

[This file presently consists of nine sources, five in English and four translations from the French. A number of important sources, mostly in French or Spanish, have not been processed for the file as yet because of insufficient funds. Many of the key unprocessed sources are reviewed in category 112 and will be referred to in the following discussion. Further bibliographical references may be found in category 113, and a rather full bibliography is presented in O'Leary (1963: 159-61). (Note: Cited references not included in categories 111 or 112 will be listed at the end of this guide.)

The Uru-Chipaya constitute an ethnolinguistic unit centering about Lake Titicaca in Perú and Bolivia, and in the Bolivian altiplano south of the lake. For an initial ethnological orientation, an article by Vellard (1959-60; see cat. 112) is highly recommended. He presents an historical and contemporary analysis of the predominant linguistic, racial, and sociocultural patterns and interrelations of the three major population groups inhabiting the Lake Titicaca region, i.e. the Aymara, the Quechua, and the Uru-Chipaya.

The question of Uru-Chipaya linguistic affiliations is a complex one. Most authorities agree that Uru-Chipaya is not closely related to either Aymara or Quechua. Vellard (1959-60: 13; see cat. 112) concludes that the Uru-Chipaya are the modern remnants of groups that spoke a widely dispersed and dialectally varied language called Pukina (Puquina) in the Spanish chronicles. 5: La Barre (p. 575) tentatively reaches about the same conclusion, but warns that this "Pukina" is not the same as the "Puquina-Uro" of De la Grasserie (1894). On the problem of broader linguistic affiliations, 5: La Barre (p. 575) accepts Métraux's classification of Uru-Chipaya as an independent linguistic family, noting that "Rivet's classification of Uru as Arawakan has not been widely accepted by linguists." This represents a change from his earlier position

(9: La Barre, p. 493), where he indicated a possible Arawakan affiliation. Mason (1950: 224) says that the relationship of Uru and Pukina to Arawakan "is quite illogical," and McQuown (1955: 542) lists Uru as a single unclassified language. On the other hand, an authority such as Greenberg (in Steward and Faron 1959: 22-23) classifies Uru as Arawakan.

Despite their probable historical and linguistic relationships, the Uru and the Chipaya constitute distinct ethnic units, both geographically and culturally. A good ethnographic summary of each group, outlining their main features and revealing some of the major differences between them, is provided in 5: La Barre. It should also be noted, however, that both groups have undergone a significant degree of Aymara acculturation, and that they now all speak Aymara as well as, or instead of, their own languages.

The Chipaya have long been reduced to a single village situated in the southern part of Carangas Province, Bolivia, to the southwest of Lake Poopó. 2: Métraux remains the basic ethnography, while Vellard's book (1954: 209-34, see cat. 112) includes a valuable first-hand report on this group, which seems to be the first substantial account to appear since Métraux's work in the early '30s. Another article by Métraux (1945; see cat. 112) provides probably the best compact summary of Chipaya environment and culture, and is illustrated with excellent photographs. 6: Ruiz and Roca, and 7: Ruiz Camacho are slight articles of minor ethnographic value. With respect to Métraux's work, it should be pointed out that he used Spanish as his research language, via an Aymara interpreter, and that he spent a relatively short time in the field, although it is not possible from his published accounts to determine the length of time with any precision. Therefore, the reliability of his Chipaya data should be critically evaluated by any researcher wishing to make use of them.

The Chipaya have diverged more than the Uru from what is presumed to be their common traditional subsistence economy of fishing and hunting, and are now primarily pastoralists, supplementing their economy by a little agriculture, hunting, and gathering. Métraux estimated the Chipaya population to be about 350 in 1930-31, and concluded that they were gradually disappearing as a distinct ethnic group. But in the early 1950s, Vellard (1954; see cat. 112) found their community to be flourishing and the population increasing — he estimates a population of between 400 and 500. Chipaya social organization is poorly reported, and the reliability of the data doubtful, but some of the main features seem to be a physical division of the village into nonexogamous, antagonistic moieties; patrilineal descent (or at least an emphasis on patrifiliation); and temporary patrilocal marital residence. Finally, Métraux stresses the "archaic" nature of Chipaya culture, in the sense that they are claimed to have retained many ancient Andean culture traits. As a consequence, Chipaya culture is said to provide a basis for a clearer understanding of Incan and other Andean ethnographic and archeological data or problems.

In contrast to the Chipaya, the twentieth-century Uru (Kot'sufis) have remained a more numerous and heterogeneous people — if one includes a number of small, dispersed groups which are evidently of Uru descent, although most are now highly mixed ethnically. On the other hand, as Vellard (1957-58: 57; see cat. 112) points out, at the end of the nineteenth century there remained only two Uru groups retaining their language and traditions. Both groups were located on the banks of the Rio Desaguadero, one group at Sojhopajha in Peruvian territory, and the other at the village of Iru-Itu (Ancoaqui?) in Bolivian territory.

The Sojhopajha group soon dissipated, and we have practically no information about them; whereas the village of Iru-Itu maintained its ethnic viability until the 1940s, and this group is the source of the bulk of the extant data concerning the Uru. Unfortunately, a disastrous drought in the years 1940-45 essentially destroyed the cultural life of Iru-Itu (see 3: Vellard; and Vellard 1950 and 1954, category 112).

5: La Barre (pp. 575-76) divides the Uru into two major groups, the Highland Uru and the Coast Uru, noting that the latter are culturally similar to the Chango. But he admits that there is no definite historical or linguistic evidence of any relationship between his two divisions. It seems best, therefore, to retain the ethnic label Uru only for the highland population.

The Uru may be divided into three main geographical clusters: (1) groups living along the shores or out in the totora reed beds of Lake Titicaca, with what seems to be the largest remaining group centered in the Bay of Puno (2) groups living along or near the Rio Desaguadero between Lakes Titicaca and Poopó; and (3) a group called the Moratos living near the shores or among the totora reed swamps of Lake Poopó. The Uru affiliation of the Moratos is not certain, however, since we have very little information about them.

9: La Barre presents a comprehensive and useful summary of Uru ethnography based on data available up to 1941, and 4: Vellard presents the main ethnographic passages concerning the Uru that he was able to extract from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spanish sources. 1: Métraux is a relatively short study of the ethnography and language of the Uru of Ancoaqui (presumably the same village which Vellard and Palavecino call Iru-Itu), based on only one week of field work, while 8: Fain is a brief, superficial account,

with excellent photographs, of a short visit to Iru-Itu by a nonsocial scientist. Polo's account (1901; see cat. 112) long remained a standard source on the Uru, drawn upon by many subsequent writers. Among its most important features are a detailed listing of places along the Desaguadero River where the remnant Uru population was located near the end of the nineteenth century, and the valuable map of the Desaguadero region drawn by Juan Bergelund. Palavecino's ethnographic study (1949; see cat. 112) provides an important complement to Métraux's work, since he did his field research only two years later, evidently in the same village.

The major authority on the Uru is Jehan Vellard, and his book (1954; see cat. 112) is the basic source on Uru ethnography and culture history. However, some of the more technical details on various aspects of Uru anthropology are omitted from the book and must be derived from his various articles. His publications result from a long-range, multidisciplinary, research project, which he directed, centering upon the Lake Titicaca region of the Andean area. A significant part of Vellard's own work focused on the Uru of Iru-Itu, and he had contact with this group for various periods of time during the years from 1938 to 1954. 3: Vellard is an important, although disappointing, source. It consists mainly of analyzed linguistic texts on a variety of cultural topics, and a study of physical anthropology. Vellard (1950; see cat. 112) includes primarily a vocabulary list arranged topically, while Vellard (1951 ; see cat. 112) is essentially a continuation of this vocabulary list. Most of Vellard (1957-58; see cat. 112) is devoted to a detailed study of Uru physical anthropology, but Vellard (1952; see cat. 112) is a valuable study, focusing upon the identification, description, history, and comparison of the various fishing groups in the area of Lake Titicaca and Poopó that may be classified as Uru or as being of mainly Uru derivation. Vellard's

book (1954) deals principally with the Uru of Iru-Itu, but it also includes the only substantial ethnographic description available of the Uru of the Bay of Puno (on pp. 105-16) and, as already mentioned, the first important account of the Chipaya since that of Métraux.

The Uru mostly follow their traditional subsistence economy, based on fishing and aquatic bird hunting. The Iru-Itu group also practice a little animal husbandry, some gathering, and a minimal sort of agriculture. Much of their material culture is based on the use of totora reeds, such as the highly distinctive technology involved in their manufacture of balsa boats. Metallurgy is unknown, and pottery making has been abandoned in recent times. Again, the data on social organization are very scanty, but Vellard's chapter on the subject (1954: 167-78) is quite important. He claims that traditional Uru social organization has mostly disappeared, but unfortunately he does not give any comprehensive description of the social system that existed during his periods of observation. He does make two highly significant negative points, however. First, he states that the people of Iru-Itu have not adopted Aymara patterns of community organization; and second, he argues convincingly (on p. 169) that contrary to previously published information by Posnansky, Métraux, and others (including Vellard himself), the Uru never had a system of clans. Iru-Itu is divided into surname groups (probably a recent development, since the names are Spanish), but these are neither sibs nor ayllus. Vellard found that if pressed on this question, the Uru, to satisfy the inquirer, will give a list of sibs, such as the four names recorded by Métraux, but that these are actually Aymara sibs belonging to the community of Jésus de Machaca to which Iru-Itu is annexed. Thus 5: La Barre (p. 581) is also incorrect in assuming that these names refer to Uru ayllus.

GUIDE TO THE SF 24 URU FILE

In conclusion, the anthropological coverage in the Uru-Chipaya file--and this seems to be fairly representative of the coverage in the literature as a whole--may be summed up as follows: There is a good deal of information about ecology, subsistence economy, and material culture; there is a fair amount of information about history, language, religion, population and settlement patterns, and physical anthropology; and there is very thin information on social organization, values, and psychological anthropology. Also, there is very little concrete behavioral data.

References

McQuown, Norman A.
1955 "The indigenous languages of Latin America," American Anthropologist, n.s. 57: 501-70.

Mason, J. Alden
1950 "The languages of South American Indians," Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 143, vii: 157-317.

O'Leary, Timothy J.
1963 Ethnographic Bibliography of South America, New Haven, HRAF Press.

Steward, Julian H. and Louis C. Faron
1959 Native Peoples of South America, New York, McGraw-Hill.]

Processed: 1965-1968
Analyst: Robert O. Lagacé